Mark Jamison PO Box 615 Webster, NC 28788 828-586-0165: H markijamison01@qmail.com

RECEIVED

2014 JAN 24 P 1:21

POSTAL REGULATORY

Chairman Ruth Goldway Commissioner Robert Taub Commissioner Mark Acton Postal Regulatory Commission 901 New York Avenue NW, Suite 200 Washington, DC 20268-0001

January 15, 2014

Dear Commissioners,

On November 22, 2013 I filed a request to review sealed materials in docket CP2014-1 and the corresponding MC docket. Because the docket itself had been closed I filed under provisions that allow for review based on issues related to the ACD. Based on the limited amount of information provided by Commission staff it appears that I followed the correct filing procedures. My filing was accepted by and posted to the Commission's electronic online filing system.

Subsequently the Postal Service and Amazon Fulfillment Services filed objections to my request. I filed a motion requesting to respond and a response to the objections that had been filed. Amazon subsequently filed additional objections to my response.

As of this date the Commission has not acted upon my request. During the period from my initial request to today the Commission has acted upon literally hundreds of filings by the Postal Service and members of the mailing industry. It would seem only reasonable that the Commission could take the brief amount of time and effort required to rule on my request. At the very least, if my request was filed improperly or was not legitimate under some rule or procedure of the Commission then basic common courtesy would have dictated that the Commission respond with some notice of that. Instead it appears the Commission has chosen to simply ignore my request.

My request and the subsequent objections raised by both the Postal Service and Amazon raise substantive issues about access to sealed materials. These issues speak directly to the Commission's claims of transparent operation and equal access to the Commission by both industry insiders and members of the general public. My request deserves a response and a ruling from the Commission and I would suggest that established procedure, not to mention basic common courtesy make a response or ruling necessary.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Vanisor

Received

JAN 22, 2014

Office of PAGR